Appl. No. 10/630,605

Amdt. dated January 25, 2008

Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2007

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 30 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 30 stand rejected as anticipated.

Applicant(s) have amended the description to correct a grammatical error.

Prior to considering the rejections, Applicant respectfully notes that the instant application claims priority on EP Application No. 02016820.9. Applicant filed a claim for priority along with a certified copy of the priority document that was received by the USPTO on Nov. 17, 2003. PAIR shows that the PTO entered the request on that date. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge the foreign priority claim and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document on the next action.

Applicant has moved the limitation of Claim 8 into Claim 1 and cancelled Claim 8. Claim 1 is also amended to clarify the relationship of the client to the server. The amendment is supported, for example, at least by Fig. 1.

Claim 4 has been amended for consistency with Claim 1.

Claim 15 has been amended for consistency with Claim 1.

Claim 24 has been moved into Claim 17 and Claim 24 has been cancelled.

Claims 1 to 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent Office Publication EPO 784276 A1, hereinafter referred to as Straahof.

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 1 to 30. Each of Claims 1, 15, and 17 includes a single client that has a plurality of communication sessions with a server. Each of the communication sessions is driven by test input data so that the single client produces a load on the server that in the prior art required multiple clients. In particular, Straahof shows in Fig. 14 that multiple clients are used. Thus, Straahof not

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P. Garden West Office Plaza 1900 Garden Road, Suite 220 Montercy, CA 93940 (831) 655-0880 Fax (831) 655-0888 Appl. No. 10/630,605

Amdt. dated January 25, 2008

Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2007

only failed to teach the invention in the same level of detail, but also taught away from the invention by teaching the use of multiple clients. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 1 to 30.

Claims 1 to 30 remain in the application. Claims 1, 4, 15, and 17 have been amended. Claims 8 and 24 were canceled. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 25, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_

Attorney for Applicant(s)

January 25, 2008
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Forrest Gunnison

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 32,899

Tel.: (831) 655-0880